TMI – Considerations for Choosing an E-discovery Platform When Too Much Information Overwhelms Your Production Plans As "individuals and corporations increasingly do business electronically ... the universe of discoverable material has expanded exponentially..."

Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC (Zubulake I), (217 F.R.D. 309, 311 (S.D.N.Y. 2003)

Respondents to a 2009 National Employment Lawyers Association survey:

- Reported spending 70% of their time and expense on discovery, though they believe that number should be closer to 50%
- Agreed while e-discovery increases the costs of litigation, properly managed e-discovery can reduce the overall costs of discovery

https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/nela summary of results of fic survey of nela members 0.pdf

Blickstein Group-Exterro's Study of Effective Legal Spend Management

94% found that using e-discovery technology effectively helps reduce e-discovery spend

What is an e-discovery platform?

ENABLES:

- Review of documents
- Finding information
- Filtering data & information
- Streamlining documentation
- Improving discovery process through tracking, tagging, filtering, sorting

Why Use an E-Discovery Platform?



- High volume of documents exchanged in discovery
- Embedded information in documents
- Private/confidential/privileged information in documents
- Document storage/space issues
- Back-up copies of crucial documents not only locally saved on firm's server

Why use an E-Discovery Platform?

- Shows diligence by producing party
- Enhanced search, sort, tagging
- Enhanced culling of information for production logs & privilege logs
- Enhanced workability with documents (i.e. bates numbering, redacting, PDF conversion, commenting and tagging)

Why use an E-Discovery Platform?

- Reduces risk of inadvertent production of privileged/confidential information
- More easily discover key information
- Aids in preparing trial exhibits

. . .

Critical Questions to Ask



5 Key Factors When Choosing a Vendor

- Respect for Users
- Security
- Innovation
- Speed
- □ Transparency

Choosing a vendor is challenging, but crucial:

- Overwhelming number of vendors
- Resistance to change
- Lack of urgency
- E-discovery is viewed as a cost center

GJORDING FOUSER

What to look for in a platform?

- Sorting
 - i.e. emails by sender/recipient/subject/date
- Managing document families& email chains
- Tech support and responsiveness
- Tagging documents & commenting functions
 - Ability to customize and modify
- Access to client and experts?

- Smart searching for redactions to remove PHI, personal data
- Cost
- Ability to see who, when, and what changes made to documents
- Bates numbering/redacting/Pdf conversion
- Speed
- Ease of learning/use

The IRCP and E-Discovery

- Current Rules
- Proposed Changes by the ISC CJRTF
- Considerations

Current IRCP 26(b)(1)(B)

Discovery Scope and Limits

- A party need not provide discovery of electronically stored information from sources that the <u>party</u> <u>identifies as not reasonably accessible because of</u> <u>undue burden or cost.</u>
- On motion to compel discovery or for a protective order, the party from whom discovery is sought must show that the information is not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost.
- If that showing is made, the court may nonetheless order discovery from such sources if the requesting party shows good cause, considering the limitations of Rule 26(b)(1)(C).
- The court may specify conditions for the discovery.

Current IRCP 34

Requests for ESI

- Recognizes ESI as the type of item that may be requested.
- Requires that the request "specify the forms or forms in which the ESI is produced."

Responses to ESI Requests

- Allows objections to requests for ESI.
- Requires that a responding party must state the form of ESI it intends to use if the objection is to a requested form type.
- Also requires that the responding party to produce ESI in "a form or forms in which it is ordinarily maintained <u>or</u> in a reasonably usable form or forms."
- Responding parties "need not produce the same [ESI] in more than one form."

Idaho Supreme Court Civil Justice Reform Task Force

- "The suggested changes to the civil rules are intended to provide more timely and cost-effective justice in approximately 70 percent of the general cases filed in Idaho courts."
- "The Task Force recommendations are designed to fulfill the promise of IRCP 1 'to secure the just, speedy and inexpensive determination' of these types of civil cases."

Task Force Recommendations

- Discovery based on a tiered system.
- Requiring proportionality standard.
- Requiring initial disclosures.



DISCOVERY TYPE	TIER 1 – SIMPLE	TIER 2 – REGULAR	TIER 3 – COMPLEX
Interrogatories	5	10	20
Requests for Production	5	10	20
Requests for Admissions	10	20	40
Total Hours of Fact Depositions	5	15	30

Proposed Change -- Tiered Discovery Limitations

State courts will now be asked to designate a case tier based on an analysis of numerous factors, such as a stipulation, the amount in controversy, discovery needs, expert needs, etc. The tier of a case will influence trial scheduling and amount of discovery permitted, like the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure's proportionality standard.

Proposed Changes Rule 16

Seven (7) days prior to scheduling conference:

 A party who wishes a designation other than tier 1 must file civil tier worksheet.
 May be heard at sched conf.

Fourteen (14) days after scheduling conference:

 Court assigns tier type, with any "exceptions further limiting or expanding the discovery allowed."

Court assigns tier for each case, considering these factors:

- Stipulation by the parties
- Initial disclosures by the parties
- Extent & type of discovery
- Extent to which e-discovery will be necessary
- Number of witnesses
- Extent of motion practice
- Factual or legal issues
- Importance of issues
- Hostility of parties

Proportionality – Rule 26(b)(1)



Limiting discovery to "nonprivileged matters relevant to any party's claim or defense" and requiring that the information sought be proportional in light of a number of factors. The scope and proportionality limits are the same as currently embodied in the recently amended federal rules of civil procedure.

--Idaho Supreme Court Civil Justice Reform Task Force

Proportionality – Rule 26(b)(1)

General Scope of Discovery.

- Parties may obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case, considering the following:
 - the importance of the issues at stake in the action;
 - the amount in controversy;
 - the parties' relative access to relevant information;
 - the parties' resources;
 - the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues; and
 - whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit.
- Information within this scope of discovery need not be admissible in evidence to be discoverable.

Initial Disclosures – Rule 26(a)(1)

- Within 35 days of the date the first responsive pleading is due, or otherwise ordered by the Court.
- Must include:
 - Name, address and telephone of individuals likely to have discoverable information and subjects of that information
 - A copy or description of all documents, <u>ESI</u>, tangible things the party has in its possession, custody, or control
 - Computation of each category of damages claimed by disclosing party,
 including materials bearing on the nature and extent of injuries
 - Insurance agreements
 - Copies of all documents referred to by disclosing party in the pleadings

It's (probably) not too late for comments!



- CourtComments@idcourts.net
- https://isc.idaho.gov/files/Summary_Statement.pdf

Considerations

- Recognize when e-discovery will be central to your case.
- Identify confidential, trade secret, peer-review, personal information.
- Become familiar with client policies.
- Encourage preservation and avoid spoliation.
- Pursue active supplementation.



Marisa Crecelius & Christina Hesse Gjording Fouser PLLC